

rights abuser, a country that is expanding its military power, an expansionist in its territory, is this the kind of country that we want to give Normal Trade Relations to?

Mr. Speaker, I believe in free trade. I am a Republican free-trader. But I believe in free trade between free people. If we try to do it the other way around, we are doing nothing but bolstering the regime in power in these dictatorial countries around the world.

How long ago was it? Just a few short weeks ago that 24 military American personnel that were being held hostage by this very same Communist Chinese Government. They, in fact, forced an American surveillance aircraft that was in international waters out of the air in an attempt to murder those 24 American service personnel. Instead, the plane made its way to Hainan Island, luckily; and then they were held hostage for 11 days. That was not so long ago. And now, within a very short period of time, the elected Members of this body are going to vote by a majority to give Normal Trade Relations to that government. That does not make any sense.

Not only were they holding hostage our American military personnel, but we actually have several Americans who are being held right now as we speak, or at least legal residents of the United States, who are being held hostage or being held prisoner by the Chinese, and we are basically talking about giving Normal Trade Relations to a country that is holding Americans, or at least legal residents of our country, holding them illegally, committing torture.

There was a young lady and her daughter who came to our hearing of the Committee on International Relations. Her husband, who is a doctor, a Ph.D., is being held by the Communist Chinese, and her daughter and this lady were begging us: please, please, demand that they bring back my husband, and he is an academic. He is an academic.

The Communist Chinese today are doing what? They are murdering Falun Gong people. Falun Gong, by the way, is nothing more than a meditation cult. I mean, they meditate and they have yoga; and they are being imprisoned by the tens of thousands and hundreds of them are being murdered in jail, hundreds of them. Many of these women, they are being tortured, not to mention Christians, of course, who, if you do not register like the Jews did with the Nazis, if you do not register, you get thrown in a gulag. What happens in China? What happens in China when you get thrown into the gulag? Yes, right back to World War II. Guess what? Their prisoners are worked like animals.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we should not be granting Normal Trade Relations to a country like this. And

when those prisoners are executed, and thousands of them are, China is the execution capital of the world, what does this ghoulis regime in China do? It sends doctors, their doctors out to harvest the organs from the bodies of the prisoners that they have just executed.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is time that we learn our lessons from history, not grant Normal Trade Relations with China, and to make sure we stand up for the rights of our own people and the freedom and dignity of our ex-POWs.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 130

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable Jeri Thomson as Secretary of the Senate.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO HAVE UNTIL 6 P.M., FRIDAY, JULY 13, 2001, TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 7, COMMUNITY SOLUTIONS ACT OF 2001

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until 6 p.m. on Friday, July 13, 2001, to file a report on the bill, H.R. 7.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KELLER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman Member of this Chamber, and as one who has supported campaign finance reform and fought for campaign finance reform for close to 10 years, I need to express my great disappointment in the vote that occurred earlier today in which we defeated the rule on campaign finance reform legislation and, thus, have disallowed that legislation from coming forward.

Before I share exactly how I voted, though, I think it is important to share some of my history on this issue and how I live campaign finance reform and not just talk about it.

Over the last 9½ years as a candidate first in the State House and now in Congress, I have never accepted political action committee money. I have limited the amount of money I have spent; I have limited the amount of my personal money I have spent. In fact, in my campaign for Congress a year ago,

I limited my expenditures in the primary to less than \$150,000; and I was outspent five to one by one opponent, three to one by another, two to one by a third opponent. We did grass-roots campaigning; and thanks to the people of my district, we were successful. I ran in that fashion because I believe money is wrongly influencing the governing process, and I think it is time we do better by the people we are elected to represent.

Unfortunately, we did not get that opportunity today; and despite my strong support for campaign finance reform; in fact, in the June 30 reports of this year, I imagine I will probably pretty easily be the Member with the lowest amount, with \$7,000, maybe \$8,000 in my campaign treasury, compared to hundreds of thousands of dollars, because I am not interested in being a fund-raiser, I am interested in being a public servant. But despite that history, despite that I seek not just to preach about campaign finance reform, but to try to practice campaign finance reform, citizens may be surprised to learn that I voted against the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the maker of the underlying bill that was to come before the House; I voted against the position of the distinguished Senator from Arizona who wanted a vote against the rule. I think it is important that we discuss why I voted that way, even as an adamant supporter of campaign finance reform.

I would contend that the defeat of the rule and, thus, the disallowance of the bill coming up for a vote is a huge step backwards. What we have done is send the bill back to committee where it may never come out of for the rest of the session; and under the best-case scenario under the rules of this House, it will at least be several months before we get another opportunity to bring it to the floor.

What was the alternative if we had supported the rule and brought it forward? Was it perfect? No. In fact, if I had my druthers, I would go one heck of a lot further than we were proposing to do in the underlying legislation and the amendments. But if we had allowed it to come forward, if we had approved the rule, we would have had the gentleman's bill before this House, a very comprehensive campaign finance reform piece of legislation. We would have had 17 amendments before this House, 12 of which the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) was preparing to offer. We would have had the opportunity for two substitute campaign finance reform bills to be discussed, debated, and openly voted on in this House. What did we get? Nothing. Not one vote. We got a rule denial that sent it back to committee, and we have lost tremendous ground.

The worst-case scenario that could have occurred if we had supported the rule, that we would move a piece of legislation forward either that was in

such good form and in such similar form as the Senate legislation, as the McCain-Feingold legislation, that the Senate would have concurred in it, and we would have taken a huge step to eliminating soft money, to reducing the influence of money on the process. Under the worst-case scenario, we move forward and come out with a bill that the Senate did not like, we go to conference. So we are in conference where we can hammer it out between the Senate and the House. Instead, we are still in a committee in the House, a long way from getting to a final piece of legislation.

What was the grounds for defeating the rule, those who voted against the rule. Why? What did they not like about the rule? It came down to this. This is important for the citizens of this Nation to understand. It came down to procedure over substance. It was not a question of whether each and every one of the gentleman's amendments was going to get a vote. All 12 of them under the rule would get a vote. It is that he and others wanted them all to be voted as one, in one lump sum, they had to take it or leave it, one lump sum. Do I not think that was a good approach? I think the 12 amendments was fair, was reasonable. Each and every amendment would have gotten a vote on the floor; it would have been openly discussed and debated. Instead, none of them came to the floor and the underlying bill did not.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day, I think. As one who has fought for this reform, and we got so close to getting a substantive vote, and instead, we are back in committee. All 228 members who voted against the rule, if they so strongly believe the rule was flawed, I would encourage each and every one of them and I would hope that each and every one of them will bring forward a discharge resolution with what they think we should do and that all 228 are on that discharge resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that we as a House do campaign finance reform once and for all and do it right.

STATUS REPORT ON THE CURRENT LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2002 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2002 THROUGH FY 2006

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and section 201 of the conference report accompanying H. Con.

Res. 83, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2002 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2002 through 2006. This status report is current through July 11, 2001.

The term "current level" refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set forth by H. Con. Res. 83. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2002 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the "section 302(a)" allocations made under H. Con. Res. 83 for fiscal year 2002 and fiscal years 2002 through 2006. "Discretionary action" refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2002 with the "section 302(b)" suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2003 of accounts identified for advance appropriations in the statement of managers accompanying H. Con. Res. 83. This list is needed to enforce section 201 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

The fifth table compares discretionary appropriations to the levels provided by section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. If at the end of a session discretionary spending in any category exceeds the limits set forth in section 251(c) (as adjusted pursuant to section

251(b)), a sequestration of amounts within that category is automatically triggered to bring spending within the established limits. As the determination of the need for a sequestration is based on the report of the President required by section 254, this table is provided for informational purposes only. The sixth and final table gives this same comparison relative to the revised section 251(c) limits envisioned by the budget resolution.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2002 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 83

(Reflecting action completed as of July 11, 2001—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year—	
	2002	2002–2006
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	1,626,488	(1)
Outlays	1,590,474	(1)
Revenues	1,638,202	8,878,506
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	977,899	(1)
Outlays	1,194,235	(1)
Revenues	1,672,152	8,897,349
Current Level over (+) / under (–) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	–648,589	(1)
Outlays	–396,239	(1)
Revenues	33,950	18,843

¹ Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2003 through 2006 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2002 in excess of \$648,589,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2002 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2002 in excess of \$396,239,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2002 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would result in revenue loss for FY 2002 in excess of \$33,950,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 83.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue loss for the period FY 2002 through 2006 in excess of \$18,843,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 83.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JULY 11, 2001

(Fiscal years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2002		2002–2006 total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	7,350	7,350	7,350	7,350
Current Level	0	2	0	0